A Nuclear Document the Press Ignored

Full Text: Cong. Porter's Open Letter Putting 21 Sharp Questions on Testing to the AEC, Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VI, NO. 22 JUNE 9, 1958 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Why de Gaulle Is Likely to Fail

As these lines are being written, de Gaulle is on his way to Algiers. All who love France must hope that he will succeed in mastering the rebels and in imposing upon them at last a reasonable solution of the Algerian question. But the more closely one begins to study the situation, the less hopeful it appears to be. Here are some of the reasons why de Gaulle, unhappily, may fail:

Too Late for Integration

1. "Integration" is no longer a feasible solution. Too many lies, too many tortures, too many disappointments now lie between the Algerian Moslem and the French. Two decades ago in the first promise of Leon Blum's Popular Front government, it was still possible to win Algerian moderates like Ferhat Abbas to the prospect of becoming full Frenchmen. But the same Algerian colonists now in revolt wrecked the Blum-Violette plan to start by giving civil rights to 30,000 Moslem Algerians. When de Gaulle's Free French government imposed these very limited reforms six years later, it was too late. The Algerians had been driven into nationalism. De Gaulle's famous liberal "Brazzaville Declaration" was already out-of-date in its integrationism when he issued it in 1944. As our brave friend, Claude Bourdet's *France-Observateur* shows in its issue of May 29, Syria, Lebanon, Morocco and Tunisia—and the Algerian nationalists—already wanted independence rather than integration. The Algerians have good reason to suspect that integration is a "pie-in-the-sky" fraud.

Racialism Spreads in France

2. Only independence can end the war in Algeria, but the *colons* did not conspire to bring de Gaulle back in order—as they see it—to liquidate themselves in an Arab sea. Their resistance will be helped not only by the indifference or hostility that white populations generally show to the struggle of colored men for equality but to something new and more dangerous. That is the growth in France, even—if not especially—among its white working class, of racial prejudice against the Algerian immigrant worker. In Algeria itself, as in our South, the lower class whites are more bitter and intemperate racially than the upper class. In France, the same racialism has infected the white worker. With this has come an upsurge of nationalism, the feeling that the loss of Algeria will be the end of France as a great power. The paranoid mentality on which Fascism breeds is evident in the distortion that sees the U. S. as somehow conspiring to take North Africa away from France. The apathy of the majority and the Fascist-nationalist sickness among a minority make the imposition of a peaceful solution in Algeria most difficult.

A Bright Shiny New—Political Corpse

"Above all, the insurgents had a policy for ending the Algerian war—a policy so radical that no French government had ever dared put it into effect. While Moslems and Frenchmen alike cheered him on, burly Jacques Soustelle, who escaped a police guard in Paris to fly to Algiers, called for complete integration of 1,000,000 French and 8,700,000 Moslem Algerians. Cried Soustelle: 'Let each one of us be French like all the rest, with the same rights and duties'."

—Time Magazine, June 2, 1958.

"Strange things were meantime [in January 1956] happening in Algiers itself. Governor-General Soustelle . . . whose appointment had not been renewed . . . left Algiers in the midst of a tremendous [European] demonstration. . . . On the face of it, his 'integration' plan of Janaury 11 had not greatly pleased the Europeans, but they knew that it was little more than so much window-dressing and that the heart of de Gaulle's former right hand man was in the right place."

—Alexander Werth, Lost Statesman, the Strange Story of Mendes-France (1958).

"Political integration would have to come by stages, together with an intensive education of the Moslem masses. . . . There would have to be intensive economic integration, which would cost France a great deal of money. . . . The Moslems, if they wanted integration, would have to work harder. . . ."

—As explained by M. Leon Delbecque, leader of the "colon" revolt, to the Times of London correspondent in Algiers (Times, May 31).

"One cannot build the future by exhuming corpses. Integration is dead. The prefabrication of "spontaneous' demonstrations in the Forum of Algiers will not succeed in resuscitating it. . . . For the sake of peace, the FLN [the Algerian National Liberation Front] hopes that France may have a government strong enough to tell the truth to the French people, to put an end to the myth of integration, to recognize the independence of Algeria . . . and to enter into new mutually profitable economic, cultural and technical relations with the 25 millions of North Africans. . . ."

—Ferhat Abbas, famous Algerian moderate, interviewed in his Swiss exile home by Claude Bourlet's independent weekly, France-Observateur, May 29, 1958.

Corruption in French Socialism

3. A section of the French socialist party has been corrupted by this spreading malaise, and the two leading Socialists in de Gaulle's Cabinet have a history which must make Algerian Moslems fear that they could easily shift from

(*Continued on Page Four*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It Took Almost A Year to Squeeze Out A Meagre and Chilly Little Report on HR 8269

News Blackout Hides AEC Rejection of Bill to Suspend Nuclear Testing

There was an extraordinary blackout of news in one sector of the nuclear testing controversy last week. This is the story in sequence. After Congressman Charles O. Porter (D., Ore.) last June introduced a bill, HR 8269, to suspend nuclear testing while other countries refrain from the explosion of nuclear devices, it was quickly buried in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. It took eight months before Porter could even get the Committee to ask the AEC for a report on the bill and three months more before he could get the AEC to react.

When the AEC under date of May 23 finally sent the Joint Committee a meagre and chilly little missive turning thumbs down on the bill, the fact that it had been rejected was announced neither by the AEC nor the Joint Committee. When Porter himself released the news to the wire services on May 26, none carried it. The news was again ignored when Porter took it to the floor of the House May 28 and said, "Perhaps events will make this legislation unnecessary but this is all the more reason why hearings should be held, the facts brought out and the issues fully explored."

The kind of factual and policy questions which need to be examined are indicated in a letter Porter released May 28 asking the AEC 21 questions which reflect knowledge he gained during his recent visit to the Pacific proving grounds. We reprint the full text here, and urge our readers to press for public hearings on HR 8269. The fact that experts are soon to meet on testing does not make cessation a foregone conclusion. The AEC letter on the Porter bill opposed separation of testing from the rest of the disarmament package.

Text of Porter Letter Asking AEC for Open Answers to 21 Questions

Here are a number of questions which I should like the Commission to answer in an unclassified letter:

1. Why are the press and other informational media barred from Eniwetok for the whole Hardtack series with the exception of one shot? The top scientists and military men there assure me that there is nothing secret there outside of the boxes containing the devices themselves. There are ample facilities to accommodate ten to thirty media representatives. And people everywhere want to know and are entitled to know more about the purposes and conduct of these tests.
2. What is the point of the Pinion operation? It seems to me a waste of time and money to show the 32 persons from all over the world something that has been demonstrated before and is not news, namely, that there is no immediate local fall-out from an airburst of a device in our possession. Most people remember the picture in LIFE sometime ago showing the three Air Force officers standing directly under an air burst and doing so in perfect safety.
3. Chairman Strauss has on several occasions defended the the present series of tests by asserting our need for a relatively "clean" anti-missile missile so radioactive debris won't fall back on us as we seek to defend ourselves. Is it not true and rather well known that a high altitude burst, even of a dirty device, has no local fall-out?
4. If the Hardtack series, is, as there is reason to believe, relatively "clean," why cannot you announce the approximate total additions from these shots to the stratospheric reservoir? If it is less than 10 megatons, why not publicize this fact and show up the last Soviet test series?

Can't the AEC Be More Explicit?

5. Can't you be more explicit about the particular purposes of the Hardtack series and the priorities among the purposes? Cleanliness and peaceful applications are given equal weight with smallness in previous statements, yet it seems clear this is not the case.
6. Why not separate peaceful applications of nuclear devices from the purely military shots? Invite the UN to participate, hold them all underground, and make public everything but the devices in the black boxes themselves.
7. Why not announce more details about the tests now being conducted and announce every shot? At present the one sentence announcement is meaningless except that it stirs the public to wonder what actually is happening and how many other shots have been completed without disclosure.
8. Why can't the AEC issue more information about "clean" bombs? It is not exactly a secret that superbombs derive their energy from the fission of U-238 and yet the AEC has not admitted this over a four year period.
9. Why should not we quit testing, on a multilateral basis, since presumably we are ahead of the Soviet Union, having a four year lead in testing and having tested more than twice as many bombs as they have?
10. Does testing for better military weapons ever end? Are we not seeking perfection endlessly? It is public knowledge that the Armed Forces have atomic artillery of various calibre, depth charges, air to air, ground to air, and air to ground nuclear warheads for missiles. Will the need for more "sophisticated" weapons ever be satisfied?
11. Do we not have enough nuclear warheads and the means of delivering them right now to deter any intentional attack?
12. Since the inception of the H-bomb, what "safe rate of annual testing" meaning megatons of fission debris per year has the AEC used in its test program? How was this safe level agreed upon within the AEC and when was the first "safe level" solicited by the Commission from its technical advisors?
13. When did the AEC receive a military specification for a clean bomb?
14. Have the natives of Rongelap and other Marshallese sought compensation for radiation injuries received as a result of U. S. bomb tests? Has any compensation been granted?
15. Is it possible to test a nuclear weapon in space with a high degree of safety? What about the flash?

Danger from Anti-Missile Missiles?

16. If missiles are armed with nuclear warheads for intrecepting ICBM's would a nuclear explosion result if these missiles aborted in take-off or if they plunged to earth?
17. AEC spokesmen have repeatedly asserted that the U. S. is far ahead of the Soviets in nuclear weapons. Upon what type of evidence is this assertion based?

Estimates of Soviet capability—including the date of their first A-bomb and first H-bomb have been badly in error.

18. Since the AEC is charged by law with responsibility for carrying out weapon development, including testing, would it not be desirable for some other agency of the government to appraise the radiation hazards from test programs?
19. In view of Soviet technical achievements, including Sputnik III, would it not be wise to reappraise our policy of secrecy in scientific development? Is it not possible that we are hurting ourselves with too much secrecy?
20. Would the AEC agree to Senator Anderson's proposal that we halt "the testing of nuclear weapons of more than one megaton intensity"?
21. The assertion has been made that if we agreed to cease testing qualified scientists could not be retained at the Los Alamos Laboratory. Has any poll been taken of these scientists which substantiates this contention? Would not these scientists stay on the job if granted freedom to pursue unclassified and publishable scientific work?

May 26, 1958 CHARLES O. PORTER

(NOTE: I was told at the AEC this morning that there will be 34 news men and 15 UN observers at the Pinion operation and that the shot will not be an air burst but on the surface, still with the purpose of demonstrating cleanliness. Since all the other tests in this series are kept shrouded in secrecy and since this is not a unique or very significant accomplishment, I doubt that the United States will regain very much ground in world opinion as a result of this operation. This statement should be considered when reading *paragraph 2*, above.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congressional Rightists Dislike Supreme Court Barrier to Third Degree Methods

A Bill to Revise the Constitution for the Convenience of the Cops

That basic and continuous undercurrent of Congressional hostility to fundamental liberties is not limited to areas in which the rights of radicals are at stake. The majority report of the House Judiciary Committee (No. 1815) recommending passage of HR 11477, the so-called Mallory case bill, demonstrates again that this un-American attitude extends to the broader area of protection for ordinary citizens against the police. The "copper" mind and the police state mentality are evident in this bill to reverse the effect of the Supreme Court decision last June 24 in the case of Andrew Mallory, a 19-year-old Negro of subnormal mentality.

The Court unanimously set aside his conviction of rape and remanded for a new trial on the ground that a confession was elicited from him by unlawful means. He was held almost eight hours without being arraigned although rule 5 (a) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure provide that an arrested person be taken before a committing magistrate "without unnecessary delay." This is a barrier against third degree methods, and prolonged imprisonment during investigation.

Our hat is off to Congressman Emanuel Celler, chairman of House Judiciary, a tireless tribune where basic liberties are concerned, and to the three others—Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Lester Holtzman and Roland V. Libonati—who joined him in an eloquent minority report. Write your Congressman to oppose HR 11477, a bill to restrict constitutional rights for the convenience of the police. This is another in the crop of new measures to reverse various liberal Supreme Court decisions.

The ugliest aspect of the Mallory case controversy is the mob-and-nightstick premise, easily discernible beneath the smooth phrases of the Southern constitutionalists, that Negroes should be outside the law anyway. It should not escape notice that Congressman Keating, who would like to be Governor of New York, now the ranking Republican on House Judiciary, voted for the Mallory bill.

Whittaker Writes Majority Opinion of Mercy Toward Anti-Franco Fighter

It was encouraging to see Mr. Justice Whittaker writing the opinion for a liberal majority in the Bonetti deportation case. The question on which the Court split 6-3 (Clark, Frankfurter and Harlan dissenting) was a narrow and difficult one. The Internal Security Act of 1950 provides for the deportation of any alien who becomes a member of the Communist party at any time after his entry. Frank Bonetti entered in 1923 at the age of 15, was a member of the Communist party from 1932 to 1936, when he quit never to rejoin. In 1937 he lost his rights of residence in this country by leaving to fight against the Franco rebellion in Spain. He came back to this country in 1938 and was readmitted after a hearing at which he freely admitted past membership in the Communist party. The question which split the Court was whether the term "entry" in the 1950 statute was to be read as meaning the original entry in 1923 or the entry of 1938. The majority invoked an earlier case which ruled that where an Act of Congress is ambiguous, it should be read on the side of lenity. The majority might have added that in any other branch of the law a right established in 1938 could not have been upset by a law passed 12 years later. Unfortunately the ex post facto clause of the Constitution does not protect aliens in deportation proceedings, the fiction being that these are "purely administrative" though they may banish a man from his home for life.

Habeas Whitewash, or Trial by Hired Press Agent and Morris Ernst

Imagine a murder case in which the leading suspect, while refusing to cooperate with the police, hires a press agent who in turn hires two lawyers to make an "independent investigation" for a substantial retainer ($50,000 plus $50,000 for expenses). When the lawyers turn in a report absolving the suspect of guilt, the *New York Times* comments editorially that "no one would question the probity" of the two lawyers. This is exactly what happened in the Galindez murder case where the Dominican dictator, Trujillo, hired a public relations counsellor, Sydney S. Baron, for $60,000 plus expenses to handle an investigation of Trujillo. Baron hired Morris L. Ernst and William H. Munson to do the legal work. Whatever their probity, the situation certainly does not do credit to their sense of propriety. Indeed if Trujillo were an American citizen and not a foreign dictator beyond our jurisdiction, this whole affair might be investigated by some bar association as of questionable ethics. Self-trial by press agentry is something new in jurisprudence. The final report by Mr. Ernst reads like a defense counsel's one-sided summation to a jury. Congressman Charles O. Porter (D. Ore.) who put the spotlight on the disappearance of the anti-Fascist exile Galindez (just when the later was finishing a book on Trujillo's bloody reign) told a press conference here the Ernst report was "a hodgepodge of suppositions" and promised a definitive reply shortly. The *New York Post*, in a devastating editorial analysis (June 2), correctly observed that to a casual reader unfamiliar with the Galindez murder or the Trujillo dictatorship, "Ernst's study suggests that Trujillo is the innocent victim of a drama engineered by Galindez and promoted by the U. S. press." We believe this peculiar investigation ought itself to be investigated by a committee of Congress, perhaps the forthcoming Morse inquiry into our relations with Latin America.

Senator Douglas Lets Slip the Truth About That Subversive, Cyrus Eaton

When Senator Douglas of Illinois rose on the Senate floor to deplore the subpoena issued by the House Un-American Activities Committee for Cyrus Eaton after the Cleveland capitalist dared criticize the FBI, only one Senator—Humphrey of Minnesota—came to Douglas's support. Even these two intrepid Senators disassociated themselves from Eaton's criticism of the FBI, perhaps the No. 1 sacred cow of American society. Douglas also went out of his way to make it clear that he disagreed with Eaton on Communist China. Humphrey fell back on Voltaire. No one, of course, mentioned the close liaison which has long existed between Hoover and the witch hunt committees of Congress, or his admiration for the late Joe McCarthy. It is many years since anyone in Congress has dared criticize Hoover. While half a dozen great newspapers, including the *New York Herald-Tribune*, have come to Eaton's defense, Congress is cowed. There was a rich vein of unconscious comedy in the way the one-time Left Socialist, Douglas defended Eaton's ideological respectability. "There is no question," the Senator from Illinois said, "but that Mr. Eaton believes strongly in the capitalistic system under which he has prospered. . . . He believes, however, in a purified capitalism. . . ." At that point, listening from the gallery, we could almost hear the FBI say *"Aha!"*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mollet and Lejeune in de Gaulle's Cabinet Symbols of French Duplicity

(*Continued from Page One*)

de Gaulle to a more rightist regime if de Gaulle falls or is driven back into retirement. The one-time Left Socialist, Guy Mollet, who launched his Republican Front government in January, 1956, by declaring peace in North Africa his first aim, "What we must do before anything else is to stop lying . . . we must stop all this blind and insane repression," was soon won over by the Algiers mob. Max Lejeune, Mollet's Secretary of State for War Operations in Algeria, now de Gaulle's Secretary of State for the Sahara, shielded the brutal repressions of Lacoste and Massu. It was Lejeune who took direct responsibility for that "practical joke" in October 1956 when a plane load of Algerian rebel negotiators on their way to a peace conference with Borguiba and the Sultan of Morocco in Tunis was seized in violation of international law. The purpose of the Tunis conference, arranged with Mollet's approval, was to work out a negotiated North African peace. This is what the *colons* feared and wanted at any price to break up. They succeeded at the price of offending both the Sultan and Borguiba, and strengthening the extremists; Ben Bella and his three fellow Algerian negotiators are still unlawfully imprisoned in Paris. Mollet and Lejeune are symbols in Algeria of French duplicity and repression, all the more enraging since it comes from Socialists.

A Darker Possibility

4. While a reading of de Gaulle's memoirs rebuts the caricature of him built up by hostile American and British official attitudes—he is a soldier of extraordinary gifts and magnanimity—he does have serious limitations. He is at his best in symbolizing and leading on simple, almost negative, lines—as in the resistance. More complex problems, like that of currency reform in the first de Gaulle government, seem to be beyond his capacity. He has a tendency to retire in a huff where craft, flexibility and compromise—the political qualities—are required. Assuming that his intentions in Algeria are really enlightened, he will find himself up against the most complex problem of his career, forced to combat the very forces which brought him to power. There is the darker possibility, however, that he may have been more deeply involved in the Algiers plot than his unofficial spokesmen and off-the-record smoothies will admit. In that case there will be no end of trouble, renewed war in North Africa and civil convulsions in France, and the U. S. and the U. S. S. R. may be drawn in.

"Onward, Christian Soldiers . . ."

"General Massu [chief of the paratroopers in Algiers] was known to have been profoundly disturbed by the third degree methods that necessity obliged him to use to wipe out the cells and so to save hundreds of other innocent lives from terrorism and restore the city to calm. On several occasions he consulted the Roman Catholic authorities here [in Algiers] in an agony of spirit, but finally decided that it was his duty as a Christian and a soldier to go on with the work."

—From the self-serving story fed to the Times of London (Times, June 2; New York Times, June 4) by a participant in the Algiers uprising.

"How are the tortures justified? It is sometimes said that it is right to torture a man if his confession can save a hundred lives. This is nice hypocrisy [Henri] Alleg [editor of Alger Republicain, the last opposition-ist paper in Algeria] was no more a terrorist than Audin."

—Jean-Paul Sartre's introduction to Alleg's "The Question," the missing editor's account of his torture by Massu's paratroopers.

"The concentration camps today are full of the Moslem intellectual elite and of those Eurafricans who have committed the crime of maintaining contact with friends belonging to the other [Moslem] community . . . Some arrested Moslems are 'suicided'; on others, in order to obtain information, water and electric torture is used. . . . Our young people witness these atrocities; they are presented to them as inevitable; we thus risk the corruption of a generation, in making it lose that sense of historic moral values which constitute France."

—André Philip, Le Socialisme Trahi (Socialism Betrayed), a leading Socialist, one time de Gaulle's Minister of the Interior, protesting "Guy Molletism" in the French Socialist party.

Why Not A Subscription to The Weekly As A Gift for Graduation?

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

s/s/58

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.

Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in th U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED